



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
[www.uspto.gov](http://www.uspto.gov)

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/944,055	08/31/2001	Donna M. Severino	G08.004	8339

28062 7590 06/04/2003

BUCKLEY, MASCHOFF, TALWALKAR, & ALLISON  
5 ELM STREET  
NEW CANAAN, CT 06840

[REDACTED] EXAMINER

PUNIT, PRAKASH C

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2175	[REDACTED]

DATE MAILED: 06/04/2003

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

<b>Office Action Summary</b>	<b>Application No.</b>	<b>Applicant(s)</b>	
	09/944,055	SEVERINO ET AL.	
	<b>Examiner</b>	<b>Art Unit</b>	
	Prakash C Punit	2175	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --  
**Period for Reply**

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

**Status**

1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on \_\_\_\_.  
 2a) This action is FINAL.                    2b) This action is non-final.  
 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

**Disposition of Claims**

4) Claim(s) 1-24 is/are pending in the application.  
 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.  
 5) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.  
 6) Claim(s) 1-24 is/are rejected.  
 7) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.  
 8) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

**Application Papers**

9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.  
 10) The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.  
     Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
 11) The proposed drawing correction filed on \_\_\_\_ is: a) approved b) disapproved by the Examiner.  
     If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.  
 12) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

**Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120**

13) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).  
 a) All b) Some \* c) None of:  
     1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.  
     2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_.  
     3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).  
 \* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.  
 14) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).  
     a) The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.   
 15) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

**Attachment(s)**

1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)	4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). ____.
2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)	5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) ____.	6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____

## DETAILED ACTION

### *Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102*

1. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

2. Claims 17-21 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Rubin (U.S. Patent No. 6,457,018).

As to claim 17, Rubin discloses a method for storing a document, comprising:  
conducting a search for existing records (i.e. documents) of a record management system  
(30) referencing said document (see Fig. 12; also see column 17, lines 7-11);  
submitting a request to add (i.e. load) said document to said record management system  
(30) if said search indicates that said document is not referenced in said record management system, said request identifying at least a type (i.e. class) of said document (see column 24, lines 56-61; also see column 24, lines 14-18; also see column 14, lines 46-49);

entering document data in a data entry template, said data entry template selected based at least in part on said type (i.e. class) of said document (see column 19, line 66 through column 20, line 6).

As to claim 18, Rubin discloses a method, further comprising:

forwarding said document data to a document management database, said document management database storing said document data in a document record (see column 24, line 62 through column 25, line 6).

As to claim 19, Rubin discloses a method, further comprising:

associating a document image with said document record (see column 14, lines 56-59).

As to claim 20, Rubin discloses a method, wherein said document image is associated with said document record based on a record identifier of said document record (see column 15, lines 26-29; also see column 22, lines 59-61; where “record identifier” is read on “reference”).

As to claim 21, Rubin discloses a document retrieval method, comprising:

receiving information associated with a desired document (see column 17, lines 6-9; where “desired document” is read on “relevant subject matter”);  
identifying a record (i.e. document) of a document management database containing said information (see column 17, lines 36-39);

identifying a physical location of said document (see column 16, lines 43-54), displaying information from said record (see column 17, lines 41-49); and identifying a location of an image of said document (see column 16, lines 43-54; Rubin teaches that the images are associated with text documents. And the images and annotation text are linked by a reference. So identifying the physical location of a document and image mean one and the same).

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

3. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

4. Claims 1-16 and 22-24 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Rubin (U.S. Patent No. 6,457,018) in view of Hajmiragha (U.S. Patent No. 6,289,460).

As to claim 1, Rubin discloses a data storage method, comprising:  
receiving document information associated with a document to be stored (see column 14, lines 36-39),  
generating a pending record containing said document information (see column 14, line 60 through column 15, line 5; where “pending record” is read on “annotation document”); and generating (i.e. creating) an active record (see column 16, lines 12-15; where “document is loaded in the database” indicates a new record is created).

Rubin does not teach verifying the document information and if the verifying is successful.

Hajmiragha teaches verifying the document information and if the verifying is successful (see Hajmiragha, column 7, lines 33-35; also see column 9, lines 36-39; verifying signature implicitly implies verification of document information).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have modified Rubin to include verifying the document information and if the verifying is successful.

It would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have modified Rubin by the teachings of Hajmiragha, because by having a document verification capability, considerable savings in time and money could be achieved which otherwise have to be spent on supporting a notarization system that requires one to be physically present before a notary to sign a document or approve a statement (see Hajmiragha, column 1, lines 40-43).

As to claim 2, Rubin as modified discloses a data storage method, further comprising: receiving information identifying a classification of said document (see column 14, lines 46-59); and selecting a template based on said classification (see column 20, lines 3-6).

As to claim 3, Rubin as modified discloses a data storage method, wherein said received document information is defined by said template (see column 20, lines 3-14).

As to claim 4, Rubin as modified discloses a data storage method, wherein said template is selected from among a library of available templates (see column 20, lines 3-14; where “template classes” implies there are more than one template to choose from).

As to claim 5, Rubin as modified discloses a data storage method, wherein said classification is a document collection classification (see column 14, lines 46-59; where Rubin teaches two classes of load document processing i.e. binary document and text document).

As to claim 6, Rubin as modified discloses a data storage method, further comprising: determining if said document has previously been stored (see column 24, lines 56-61).

As to claim 7, Rubin as modified discloses a data storage method, wherein said template defines a plurality of data elements required to identify a document according to said classification (see Fig. 18; also see column 23, lines 7-20).

As to claim 8, Rubin as modified discloses a data storage method, further comprising: receiving document data corresponding to each of said plurality of data elements prior to generating said pending record (see column 14, lines 46-65; where “pending record” is read on “annotation document”).

As to claim 9, Rubin as modified discloses a data storage method, further comprising:

associating said pending record (i.e. annotation document) with an image of said document (see column 15, lines 26-28).

As to claim 10, Rubin as modified discloses a data storage method, wherein said associating includes referencing a document record identifier in both said pending record (i.e. annotation document) and said image (see column 22, lines 52-61; where “record identifier” is read on “reference”).

As to claim 11, Rubin as modified discloses a data storage method, further comprising: associating said active record with an image of said document (see column 14, lines 56-59; where “active record” is read on “document”).

As to claim 12, Rubin as modified discloses a data storage method, wherein said document information includes at least one of: a collection name; a file name; subcategory information; location information; owner information; creator information; cross reference information; status information; history information; geographical information; and archive information (see column 23, lines 7-20) .

As to claim 13, Rubin as modified discloses a data storage method, further comprising: storing said pending record (i.e. annotation document) in a document management database (see column 22, lines 59-67; where “retrieving annotation text” implies the annotation document is stored in a database); and

storing with said pending record (i.e. annotation document) (see column 22, lines 59-67; where “retrieving annotation text” implies the annotation document is stored in a database.

Rubin as modified does not teach an indicator indicating that it has not yet been approved.

Hajmiragha teaches an indicator indicating that it has not yet been approved (see Hajmiragha, column 9, line 66 through column 10, line 5; Document access history contains any activity against a document implies approval/disapproval of a document are also indicated).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have modified Rubin to include an indicator indicating that it has not yet been approved.

It would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have modified Rubin by the teachings of Hajmiragha, because by having a document verification capability, considerable savings in time and money could be achieved which otherwise have to be spent on supporting a notarization system that requires one to be physically present before a notary to sign a document or approve a statement (see Hajmiragha, column 1, lines 40-43).

As to claim 14, Rubin as modified discloses a data storage method, further comprising: of said pending record (i.e. annotation document), thereby converting said pending record (i.e. annotation document) into said active record (see column 22, lines 53-67; where “linked to the actual BLOB object by a reference” implies that an active record is generated).

Rubin as modified does not teach modifying said indicator upon approval.

Hajmiragha teaches modifying said indicator upon approval (see Hajmiragha, column 4, line 37-42; where “modifying” is read on “issuing”).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have modified Rubin to include modifying the indicator upon approval.

It would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have modified Rubin by the teachings of Hajmiragha, because by having a document approval capability, considerable savings in time and money could be achieved which otherwise have to be spent on supporting a notarization system that requires one to be physically present before a notary to sign a document or approve a statement (see Hajmiragha, column 1, lines 40-43).

As to claim 15, Rubin as modified discloses a data storage method, wherein access to said pending records (i.e. annotation document) in said document management database (see column 13, lines 48-54: where “access” is read on “retrieval”).

Rubin as modified does not teach is limited to authorized reviewers operating client devices.

Hajmiragha teaches is limited to authorized reviewers operating client devices. (see Hajmiragha, column 3, lines 55-65).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have modified Rubin to include authorization of reviewers operating client devices.

It would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have modified Rubin by the teachings of Hajmiragha, because by having a authorization capability, the valuable data stored in the information retrieval system can be secured and protected thus preventing it from unauthorized users.

As to claim 16, Rubin as modified discloses a data storage method, wherein said receiving document information further comprises:

receiving document information from an external system (56) used to generate said document (see Fig. 8; also see column 13, lines 6-9).

As to claim 22, Rubin discloses a data storage system, comprising:  
means for receiving document information associated with a document to be stored (see column 17, lines 6-8);  
means for generating a pending record (i.e. annotation document) containing said document information (see column 14, lines 60-63); and  
means for generating an active record (see column 16, lines 12-15; where “document is loaded in the database” indicates a new record is created).

Rubin does not teach verifying the document information and if the verifying is successful.

Hajmiragha teaches verifying the document information and if the verifying is successful (see Hajmiragha, column 7, lines 33-35; also see column 9, lines 36-39; verifying signature implicitly implies verification of document information).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have modified Rubin to include verifying the document information and if the verifying is successful.

It would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have modified Rubin by the teachings of Hajmiragha, because by having a document verification capability, considerable savings in time and money could be achieved which otherwise have to be spent on supporting a notarization system that requires one to be physically present before a notary to sign a document or approve a statement (see Hajmiragha, column 1, lines 40-43).

As to claim 23, Rubin discloses a data storage system, comprising:

- a processor (32);
- a communications device, in communication with said processor, receiving data (see column 12, lines 40-62); and
- a memory unit in communication with said processor and storing a program (see column 12, lines 46-54), wherein the processor (32) is operative with the program to:
  - receive document information associated with a document to be stored (see column 14, lines 33-39);
  - generate a pending record (i.e. annotation document) containing said document information (see column 14, lines 60-62);
  - generate an active record (see column 16, lines 12-15; where “document is loaded in the database” indicates a new record is created).

Rubin does not teach verifying the document information and if the verifying is successful.

Hajmiragha teaches verifying the document information and if the verifying is successful (see Hajmiragha, column 7, lines 33-35; also see column 9, lines 36-39; verifying signature implicitly implies verification of document information).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have modified Rubin to include verifying the document information and if the verifying is successful.

It would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have modified Rubin by the teachings of Hajmiragha, because by having a document verification capability, considerable savings in time and money could be achieved which otherwise have to be spent on supporting a notarization system that requires one to be physically present before a notary to sign a document or approve a statement (see Hajmiragha, column 1, lines 40-43).

As to claim 24, Rubin discloses a computer-readable medium having computer-executable instructions for performing steps comprising:

receiving document information associated with a document to be stored (see column 14, lines 33-39);

generating a pending record (i.e. annotation document) containing said document information (see column 14, lines 60-62);

generating an active record (see column 16, lines 12-15; where “document is loaded in the database” indicates a new record is created).

Rubin does not teach verifying the document information and if the verifying is successful.

Hajmiragha teaches verifying the document information and if the verifying is successful (see Hajmiragha, column 7, lines 33-35; also see column 9, lines 36-39; verifying signature implicitly implies verification of document information).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have modified Rubin to include verifying the document information and if the verifying is successful.

It would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have modified Rubin by the teachings of Hajmiragha, because by having a document verification capability, considerable savings in time and money could be achieved which otherwise have to be spent on supporting a notarization system that requires one to be physically present before a notary to sign a document or approve a statement (see Hajmiragha, column 1, lines 40-43).

### *Conclusion*

5. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant’s disclosure.

The following patents are cited to further show the state of art with respect to document storage and retrieval in general:

Art Unit: 2175

U.S. Patent No. 6,457,018 to Rubin – teaches document storage and retrieval

U.S. Patent No. 6,289,460 to Hajmiragha – teaches verification of documents

U.S. Patent No. 5,201,047 to Maki et al. – teaches classifying and retrieval system

6. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Prakash Punit whose telephone number is (703) 305-5914. The examiner can normally be reached on Mondays – Fridays from 9:45 am to 6:15 pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Dov Popovici, can be reached on (703) 305-3830. The fax numbers of the group is (703) 746-7239.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application should be directed to the Group receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 305-9600.

Prakash Punit  
Patent Examiner  
Au 2175



DOV POPOVICI  
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER  
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2100

May 12, 2003